## PARTNERSHIP: OPERATIONAL NARRATIVE (A,G,H ON PAGE 8 WORTH A TOTAL OF 15 POINTS)

#### 0 - 2 Points

Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:

- 1) There is not a complete description of the partnership including:
- a. list of all partners
- **b.** how the partnership operates and evidence of ongoing collaboration to support the implementation of the partnership to reach its goals
- **c.** how the duties and responsibilities are shared between the partners
- d. how the partnership will foster communication and interaction of the partners
- 2) There is little or no evidence that the partnership has sufficient capacity to organize and manage the project
- 3) There is no evidence that the required core planning team will regularly assemble
- 4) There is not a complete description of how the effectiveness of the partnership will be assessed during the operation time frame

#### 3 - 5 Points

Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:

- 1) There is a complete description of the partnership including:
- a. list of all partners
- **b.** how the partnership operates and evidence of ongoing collaboration to support the implementation of the partnership to reach its goals
- **c.** how the duties and responsibilities are shared between the partners
- d. how the partnership will foster communication and interaction of the partners
- There is evidence that the partnership has sufficient capacity to organize and manage the project
- 3) There is evidence that the required core planning team will regularly assemble
- 4) There is a complete description of how the effectiveness of the partnership will be assessed both during the development and operation time frame

INITIAL SCORE:	

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (3x THE INITIAL SCORE):

# IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT AND SUSTAINABILITY FOR PARTICIPANTS: OPERATIONAL NARRATIVE (C, E, F, I, J ON PAGE 8-9 WORTH A TOTAL OF 20 POINTS)

#### 0 - 2 Points

Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, all of the critical attributes listed below:

- 1) There is not a complete description of how the project will provide for the implementation , support, and sustainability for the school and district participants, RESA network participants and the Montana STEM Initiative participants through professional development including:
- **a.** how time will be provided for ongoing study, practice, and practice with feedback
- b. how the project will work with teachers to adapt applicable district science or mathematics instructional strategies to increase K-12 student learning in mathematics or science
- c. how the project will facilitate targeted professional development for teachers who need more intensive or in-depth assistance through the use of regionally based job-embedded professional development delivered through a variety of venues including distance learning
- **d.** how the project will ensure the meaningful engagement of school, district, RESA, and STEM stakeholders
- **e.** how the project will provide the teachers and administrators with professional development skills to assist other educators, in their school, district, or region, on the implementation of the common standards for mathematics or on the *Framework for K-12 Science Education*
- 2) There is not a description of how continued support for the participants might occur beyond the life of the grant

#### 3 - 5 Points

Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:

- There is a complete description of how the project will provide for the implementation, support, and sustainability for the school and district participants, RESA network participants and the Montana STEM Initiative participants through professional development including:
- **a.** how time will be provided for ongoing study, practice, and practice with feedback
- b. how the project will work with teachers to adapt applicable district science or mathematics instructional strategies to increase K-12 student learning in mathematics or science
- c. how the project will facilitate targeted professional development for teachers who need more intensive or in-depth assistance through the use of regionally based job-embedded professional development delivered through a variety of venues including distance learning
- **d.** how the project will ensure the meaningful engagement of school, district, RESA, and STEM stakeholders
- **e.** how the project will provide the teachers and administrators with professional development skills to assist other educators, in their school, district, or region, on the implementation of the common standards for mathematics or on the *Framework for K-12 Science Education*
- 2)There is a description of how continued support for the participants might occur beyond the life of the grant

Initial Score:	FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (4x THE INITIAL SCORE):	

# OVERALL DESIGN AND EFFICACY OF PROJECT PLAN: OPERATIONAL NARRATIVE (B, D ON PAGE 8 WORTH A TOTAL OF 25 POINTS)

#### 0 - 2 Points

Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:

- 1) There is not a complete description of how the project will address all the program goals and grant requirements as outlined in Sections II Goals of Montana MSP Grant Program and VII Requirements and Preparation of Application
- 2) There is not a complete description of the research base for the project components
- 3) There is not a complete description of a process to identify and build on previous professional development work in the schools, districts, and RESAs
- 4) There is not a complete description of how the ongoing goal of increasing educators' understanding of the critical role of college and career readiness standards in the design and delivery of effective instruction and professional development
- 5) All applicable sections of the partnership operational narrative were not addressed
- 6) The likelihood of the overall plan being effective is low

#### 3 - 5 Points

Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:

- 1) There is a complete description of how the project will address all program goals and grant requirements as outlined in Sections II Goals of Montana MSP Grant Program and VII Requirements and Preparation of Application
- 2) There is a complete description of the research base for the project components
- 3) There is a complete description of a process to identify and build on previous professional development work in the schools, districts, and RESAs
- 4) There is a complete description of how the ongoing goal of increasing educators' understanding of the critical role of career and college readiness standards in the design and delivery of effective instruction and professional development
- **5)** All applicable sections of the partnership operational narrative were adequately addressed
- **6)** The likelihood of the overall plan being effective is moderate to high

NITIAL SCORE:	FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (5x THE INITIAL SCORE):

# EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN: EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN (A-F ON PAGE 9 WORTH A TOTAL OF 25 POINTS)

### 0-2 Points

Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:

- 1) There is not a complete description of how the project will ensure the development of an effective and comprehensive assessment and accountability process (including applicable measurable objectives) by increasing:
- **a.** active engagement of district administrators and K-12 educators
- **b.** math common standards or science *Framework* content knowledge professional development
- **c.** instructional strategies through STEM professional development including implementation assessment
- **d.** operation of the project delivery system –regional and school based workshops, distance learning and materials development
- 2) Applicable levels of the Guskey model were not addressed
- 3) There is not a complete description of what formative evaluation process will be used during implementation to identify barriers and facilitating events or structures that informs the project's ongoing planning and implementation efforts
- 4) There is not a complete description of how the project will communicate and disseminate information on the project and subsequent professional development activities to appropriate and applicable constituencies

### 3 - 5 Points

Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:

- 1) There is a complete description of how the project will ensure the development of an effective and comprehensive assessment and accountability process (including applicable measurable objectives) by increasing:
- **a.** active engagement of district administrators and K-12 educators
- **b.** math common standards or science *Framework* content knowledge professional development
- **c.** instructional strategies through STEM professional development including implementation assessment
- **d.** operation of the project delivery system regional and school based workshops, distance learning and materials development
- 2) All applicable levels of the Guskey model were addressed, with particular emphasis on Level 5
- 3) There is a complete description of what formative evaluation process will be used during implementation to identify barriers and facilitating events or structures that informs the project's ongoing planning and implementation efforts
- 4) There is a complete description of how the project will communicate and disseminate information on the project and subsequent professional development activities to appropriate and applicable constituencies

INITIAL SCORE:	FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (5x THE INITIAL SCORE):
INITIAL OCORE.	I INAL OCORE - WEIGHT I ACTOR (3X THE INITIAL 3CORE).

# BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS: BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE (DESCRIBED ON PAGES 9- 10 AND WORTH A TOTAL OF 15 POINTS)

### 0-2 Points

Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:

- 1) There is not a complete description outlining the basis for determining the amounts shown on the budget
- **2)** The budget is not in alignment with the activities described in the various parts of the grant proposal narrative
- 3) The amount assigned to a given portion of the budget seems either excessive or insufficient given the goals of the project
- 4) All the required budget forms were not included

### 3 - 5 Points

Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:

- 1) There is a complete description outlining the basis for determining the amounts shown on the budget
- 2) The budget is aligned with the activities described in the various parts of the grant proposal narrative
- 3) The amount assigned to each portion of the budget is sufficient given the goals of the project
- 4) All the required budget forms were included and complete

INITIAL SCORE:	FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (3x THE INITIAL SCORE):